DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 532 FL 015 100

AUTHOR Apodaca, Rosita
TITLE How We Educate Non-English Speaking Students Successfully. The High Intensity Language Training Program Description.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 85
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National School Boards Association (Anaheim, CA, March 31, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; *Dropout Prevention; *English (Second Language); Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Development; *Intensive Language Courses; Limited English Speaking; Outcomes of Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; *Spanish Speaking; *Student Placement; Teacher Attitudes; Transitional Programs
IDENTIFIERS El Paso Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

The El Paso Independent School District, in an effort to reduce the dropout rate and promote academic success among Hispanics, developed a high-intensity language training (HILT) curriculum in English as a second language (ESL) for limited-English-speaking students, to prepare them for full participation in regular subject-area courses. The program began in January 1982 with four levels of instruction (beginning, intermediate, advanced, and transitional) and two curriculum plans, one for students who had attended school for six or more years in their native countries, and one for students with less than six years of schooling. Each program level represents one semester in grades 9-12 and one school year in grades 7-8. Enrollment is 8-12 students in beginning courses, 15-20 in intermediate courses, and regular class size in advanced and transitional courses. Sheltered subject-area courses are included in the program at each level. Inservice teacher education workshops for both ESL and subject-area teachers has become an integral part of the program. The program has proven successful in raising the HILT students' academic achievement and ability to function in content classes. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED261532

HOW WE EDUCATE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING STUDENTS SUCCESSFULLY
The High Intensity Language Training Program Description

ROSITA APODACA
El Paso Independent School District
El Paso, Texas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rosita Apodaca

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at:

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION
1985 ANNUAL CONVENTION
ANAHEIM, CALIFORNIA
MARCH 31, 1985

FL015100

C-38 HOW WE EDUCATE NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING STUDENTS SUCCESSFULLY

INTRODUCTION

The growing Hispanic population of the United States is a source of concern and, at times, of apprehension among non-Hispanics. The reality of the Hispanic population--and of the issues, problems, and opportunities it presents--is very complex. Hispanics are a seriously disadvantaged population. The Hispanic population in the U.S. suffers from a variety of economic and social problems ranging from unemployment and underemployment to poor housing and inadequate health care. The status of Hispanics in three basic areas--income, employment, and education--provides a clear picture of their current position on the socioeconomic scale.

The low rate of educational attainment is certainly a cause for concern. Hispanics' educational attainment has increased somewhat over the past ten years, yet dropout rates remain high. One recent census estimate put the percentage of eighteen and nineteen year old Hispanic dropouts at 37% which is more than double the nation's figures (Diaz, 1984).

It is in education that the gap in achievement between Hispanics and other groups is the widest and most serious. They have high retention and dropout rates. The problems of Hispanic teenagers are most severe. The reasons why Hispanics do poorly in school are not clear. Family socioeconomic background, English language ability, and place of birth appear to be important factors. It has been difficult to establish the independent impact of schools on educational achievement. School quality, discrimination by school professionals against Hispanics, and teachers' self-fulfilling prophecies of low achievement for Hispanics are reasons given by some researchers as historically playing a role in driving Hispanics out of schools (Carter and Segura, 1979).

It is widely recognized, however, that knowledge of English increases the rates of high school completion and college entrance. The identification of 1,500 secondary school age non-English speaking students created a need for the El Paso Independent School District to build a program called the High Intensity Language Training (HILT) which addresses the multi-dimensional problems facing these teenagers.

The program addresses the differences in social conditions, culture, as well as the wide ranges in educational backgrounds and in language proficiencies that are represented in the student population. The response is an integrative design that can be implemented in the real world of the American High School.

EPISD Schools with HILT centers have found it necessary to change some of the school procedures since the students cannot do all the changing. The schools recognized that these students were not ready to operate in the machinery that had been set up for native-born students. Thus, the machinery was changed to fit the students.

This paper will discuss the magnitude of the problem, the rationale for the HILT program design, the processes of its development, and the success of the program from several perspectives.

BEFORE HILT: THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM

The El Paso Independent School District is the larger of two districts serving the city of El Paso, Texas. The district consists of 40 elementary schools; 4 elementary/intermediate schools; 1 intermediate school; 10 junior high schools; 8 senior high schools; and 7 schools with other classifications.

Ciudad Juárez, the largest Mexican City on the U.S.-Mexico border, is located directly across the Rio Grande from El Paso. Cd. Juárez has a population estimated in excess of 1,000,000. The city contributes to the unique problems faced by the El Paso Independent School District because it is the source of a constant flow of Mexicans into El Paso.

The district serves a student population of 59,924 scholastics, of whom 42,172 or 70.37% are of Hispanic origin. The percentage of economically deprived children residing in the district is 59%. The school district serves 30,896 educationally deprived students on 28 Chapter 1 campuses.

These same Chapter 1 campuses form part of 49 campuses providing bilingual instruction for the 11,164 students in Grades K-6. Nine campuses, including two Chapter 1 campuses, provide English as a Second Language (ESL) classes via the High Intensity Language Training (HILT) program to 1,500 students in Grades 7-12. These figures reflect the phenomenal changes that have occurred in the district. In 1970, the district submitted its first application for ESEA Title VII funds to establish a bilingual program in Grades K-1 on three campuses. Just four years ago the district began the planning process to identify and better serve the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in Grades 7-12.

Prior to the 1982-83 school year, the district offered only the Texas Education Agency's required English language development program.[1] Though the program was required, no funding was appropriated; thus, it was unrealistic for the district to go beyond the required program in terms of money, time, and effort. As a result, prior to January 1982, when the HILT program was established, the educational effort for secondary LEP students was minimal.

There was a dire need to establish a curricular response for the 973 secondary students who were, at that time, identified as LEP. A major problem was the prevailing attitude the principals, teachers, and students had regarding ESL. Many considered ESL a course for "dummies." Teachers did not want to teach it; bright students did not want to take it; unmotivated students did not want to leave it. Eradicating the negative attitude which administrators, students, and teachers had towards the program was imperative.

Because there was no formal identification and testing procedure for the placement of students and because of the prevailing attitude toward ESL, many students (slow learners and unmotivated students) who did not belong in the program were placed in ESL. Many students who had a need for it were not identified. A formal identification and testing procedure was sorely needed in order for these students to be served.

---

[1]Texas State Plan For Bilingual Education, Statement of Purpose, p. iii

The 973 students who were identified were enrolled in the senior and junior high schools and in the intermediate schools. Schools either had high or low concentrations of LEP students. Both situations created large enrollments of 25 to 35 students per class. The students' range in language proficiency within a classroom was from nonspeaker of English to advanced speaker of English. This made instructional planning difficult and delivery of the lessons virtually impossible. The following passage (Apodaca, 1981) describes the situation that existed:

> "The LEP student enrollment varies widely in the district. There are schools with heavy concentrations of LEP and there are schools with extremely low enrollments. The low LEP enrollment schools cannot justify a locally or SCE-funded ESOL teacher; therefore, LEP students are placed in regular English classes. Some schools have sufficient students to justify an ESOL section, but the students usually are at varying levels of proficiency. Beginning students often share classes with advanced students. The students also have varying levels of formal education. Schooled and unschooled students share classes. Not being able to have homogeneous groups makes teaching difficult for even expert teachers. A regular English teacher would find it difficult to do justice to Shakespeare and the alphabet during the same class period" (p. 2).

The difficult situation described above was aggravated by the fact that the ESL teachers were mainly regular English teachers (some were foreign language teachers) with an assignment of one or two classes of ESL (Apodaca, 1981):

> "Most of the present ESOL instructional staff are not ESOL specialists. Many of the teachers would prefer not to get an ESOL assignment, and many of the teachers who would like to teach ESOL do not get the assignment. It has not been possible to provide the necessary training because high school teachers also teach regular English or modern language courses and give priority to those because their ESOL assignment may last only one semester every two years. In junior high school, there is a high turnover of teachers, perhaps due to the fact that ESOL receives a large number of surplus teachers" (p. 1).

The curriculum consisted of four courses based primarily on a set of textbooks which used a grammatical syllabus and employed the controversial audio-lingual and grammar-translation methodologies. The syllabi did not address the students' need for subject-matter English (Apodaca, 1981):

> "The present ESOL curriculum is not comprehensive in regard to time on task or in regard to content. The present format allows a student to receive approximately 317 hours of ESOL instruction. Six level ESOL curriculums (minimal skills for communication) are written for a minimum of 500 clock hours.

> The content of most ESOL courses is not adequate for the proper preparation of ESOL students to go into regular content area and English courses. Most ESOL programs have been prepared for the foreign market, where students are prepared at the interpersonal communication skills levels. Our students need to be prepared beyond the interpersonal communication skills level to the academic language proficiency level; therefore, ESOL program materials have to be augmented by other language arts materials, and sufficient texts need to be purchased so that every student can be issued a textbook" (p. 1).

No provisions were made to delay subject matter instruction until the students had acquired sufficient English to succeed in the content courses. The LEP students were enrolled along with English-proficient students in the subject matter classes. No distinction was made between LEP students and non-LEP students, nor was there a distinction made between LEP students with an academic background and those with little or no schooling (Apodaca, 1981):

> "The content area courses presently taught in Englisn are not being understood by LEP students. The students who have had a formal education in Mexico can neither understand the teacher's lecture nor read the textbooks written in English. Students without a formal education do not have the academic prerequisites to understand junior high or high school level content in English or in their native language. Both teachers and students are frustrated. Teachers are unable to modify their curriculum to meet the needs of both the LEP and the English proficient students" (p. 1).

Because of the magnitude of the problem, in December 1980, the Deputy Superintendent created a district ESL Study Committee to address the problem areas and to find solutions that would meet the needs of the secondary LEP population. The 14-member ESL Study Committee comprised these individuals: the Deputy Superintendent; the Associate Superintendent, Administration; the Associate Area Superintendents; the Assistant Superintendent, Personnel; the Director, Federal Programs; the Director, Secondary Instruction; the three area consultants; the Consultant, Bilingual Education; a high school principal; and two ESL teachers. The committee's first meeting was held in January 1981. After only two half-day meetings, the consensus of the committee was to implement a high intensity language program. Luis Cortes, then principal of Bowie High School, summarized the general feeling of the committee when he said,

> "I need to stop lying to the parents of these children. They have crossed the border to fulfill a dream. I tell them we're going to help their children. Six weeks later, they're in my office because their children are failing. I need a program for these students. I want to help them."[2]

---

[2]Personal notes from the ESL Study Committee meetings.

The High Intensity Language Training program was implemented at Bowie High School in January 1982.

HILT: EPISD'S APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

The Bowie High School HILT program began in January 1982 with a staff of eight ESL teachers serving 184 students (128 in Grade 9; 49 in Grade 10; 7 in Grade 11; none in Grade 12). Eighteen of them were identified as having little or no previous schooling. The HILT program increased the school's enrollment by 59 and the ESL staff by 5.6. The HILT program at Bowie now serves 331 students and has an ESL teaching staff of 12. These figures are indicative of the number of students who were not being served prior to the implementation of the program.

The first semester classes were to serve as learning laboratories. Methods, materials, grouping patterns, and in-service training were tested by the teachers and the bilingual education consultant during the semester. After one semester some of the innovations were kept; some discarded; and others, identified for future testing. The district made a decision to replicate this effort on nine other campuses though there was no hard data because the positive response from administrators, teachers, and students was strong enough to warrant the expansion.

During the 1982-83 school year, 10 campuses (4 senior high schools and 6 junior high schools) operated HILT centers. That same semester, the Bowie High School HILT center was designated as a pilot program by the Texas Education Agency.

The goal of the HILT program is for its graduates to be able to participate successfully in the regular high school curriculum and in the school's extracurricular activities. In order to meet this goal, the designers of the program had to go beyond the typical plan for teaching the students English to a broad educational design that would encompass the total curriculum. It was evident from the needs assessment and from the research that the total education of the LEP students needed to be addressed. Offering only an English as a Second Language program would have ensured the continued failure of these students in the content areas as Chamot (1983) advises:

> "For language minority children in the United States, a functional ESL curriculum must go beyond the threshold level of social communicative skills and provide instruction and development in the cognitive and academic language skills needed in the classroom" (p. 459).

Placement

The program design includes four levels of instruction: beginning, intermediate, advanced, and transitional and two curriculum plans, one for students who have attended school for six or more years in their native country (schooled student) and another for students with less than six years of schooling (student with limited schooling).

The students are administered a group language proficiency test, the Comprehensive English Language Test (Harris and Palmer, 1970). The listening comprehension form (LA) is used to determine placement in the program. The structure form (SA) is used to determine placement in a particular level.

Language proficiency tests are rough instruments at best and, therefore, students are sometimes misplaced. When the student's performance in the classroom contradicts the test results, the student's teachers must meet and agree on the correct placement for the student. An individual teacher may not change the placement of the student.

Once the students are in the program, the teachers ask them to write a composition in their native language in order to evaluate the level of proficiency in their mother tongue. This procedure enables the teachers to identify students who are minimally literate in their native language and to recommend placement in the limited schooling curriculum.

Students are tested only for initial level placement. Once a student is enrolled in the program, the successful completion of a level becomes the prerequisite for the next level. Students who make remarkable progress may be advanced a level upon the recommendation of the program teachers and the approval of the school principal. Conversely, students who make little or no progress may be retained at a level or placed at a lower level.

Class Loads

The four beginning level courses are approved for a minimum enrollment of 8 and a maximum enrollment of 15 students per class. The three intermediate ESL courses are approved for a minimum enrollment of 15 and a maximum enrollment of 20 students per class. The two ESL advanced level courses and the transitional courses are approved for regular size enrollment, (See Table A).

Program Time Line

Each level represents one semester in Grades 9-12 and one school year in Grades 7-8. The length of a student's enrollment in the program depends on his entry point, (See Table A).

TABLE A

PROGRAM TIME LINE

	GRADE 7	GRADE 8	GRADE 9	GRADE 10	GRADE 11	GRADE 12
ENTRY POINTS	Beg.	Int.	Adv. / Trans.			
			Int. / Adv.	Trans.		
			Beg. / Int.	Adv. / Trans.		
			Beg.	Int. / Adv.	Trans.	
				Beg. / Int.	Adv. / Trans.	
				Beg.	Int. / Adv.	Trans.
					Beg. / Int.	Adv. / Trans.

= 1 school year

= 1 semester

Student : Teacher Ratio

Beginning	= 15 : 1
Intermediate	= 20 : 1
Advanced	= 30 : 1
Transitional	= 30 : 1

Beginning Level

The students who enter beginning level receive intensive instruction (four courses) in English as a Second Language. In addition to the ESL courses, the students are placed in sheltered mathematics courses that correspond to their mathematical ability.[2] Sheltered courses (Krashen, 1982) are regular content courses open only to LEP students. The syllabus and materials are the same as for the regular courses, but the methods of presentation are modified (Chamot, 1983) to make the content comprehensible to the student. The teachers are provided with workshops that instruct them on how to use methodologies appropriate for ESL students (Apodaca, 1983). The teachers mediate instruction in Spanish when it is necessary.

[2]Misplacement of students in courses too advanced or too low will increase the failure rate or decrease motivation. The use of a mathematics placement instrument is important.

The student may ask questions in Spanish. The teachers may answer in Spanish or English, whichever is appropriate to the question. The teachers are asked to exercise professional judgement regarding the use of the student's native language (Apodaca, 1983):

> "Teachers are asked to use their good judgement about when to use the student's native language. Teachers are to use English for instructional purposes and are not required to speak the student's native language to teach in this program. There may be times when it becomes absolutely necessary for the students to have complete comprehension of a situation, event, directions, or the like. Teachers who speak the student's native language may do so in order to ensure comprehension in those situations that require it" (p. 15).

The program teachers are cautioned not to misinterpret situations in which the students do not use English (Apodaca, 1983):

> "Students do not mean to be disrespectful when they use their native language. It is natural for them to speak to their peers in the native language. Beginning level students are struggling to understand. They generally do not have the vocabulary to express all they want to say. Do not expect students to speak beyond their level of proficiency. Encourage the use of English, but do not be unreasonable in your demands. Sometimes students do not understand, and they must use the native language to ask someone for help or information. Remember that speaking ability emerges on its own after enough competence has been developed through listening and understanding. We acquire spoken fluency <u>not</u> by practicing talking but by understanding input. It is, in fact, theoretically possible to acquire language without ever talking. Speaking makes an indirect contribution to language acquisition. That is, the more a student speaks, the more people will talk to him/her. In fact, speaking affects the quantity of input as well as the quality of the output. Speaking should be encouraged, but not to the detriment of the student. It should be done in a positive manner" (p. 22).

The sheltered mathematics' students have access to computer assisted instruction to accommodate the varying levels of mathematical ability. Because most high school teachers are not used to teaching mathematics at a primary level or having three or four ability groups, it was necessary to equip one classroom at each HILT center with terminals that are hooked up to a minicomputer. The mathematics computer program has lessons ranging from basic operations to algebra.

A typical beginning student's schedule is as follows:

	Code	Content
1.	ESOL 1a	Listening, Understanding, and Speaking
2.	ESOL 1b	Speaking and Writing
3.	ESOL 1c	Reading and Composition
4.	ESOL 1d	English for Math
5.	Sheltered Mathematics	(Depends on the student's background)
6.	Physical Education	(Student's choice)
7.	Elective[3]	(One which requires little or no English reading or writing is recommended)

Intermediate Level

As the student progresses in his use of English, he advances to the intermediate level. At this level, English as a Second Language instruction is reduced to three courses, and an additional sheltered content course is added.

An intermediate student's schedule is as follows:

	Code	Content
1.	ESOL 2a	Listening, Understanding, and Speaking
2.	ESOL 2b	Reading and Composition
3.	ESOL 2c	English for Science
4.	Sheltered Mathematics	(Continuation class from beginning level)
5.	Sheltered Science	(Based on the student's background)
6.	Physical Education	(Student's choice)
7.	Elective[3]	(One which requires little or no English is recommended)

[3]Only in Grades 7-8. Senior high schools have a six-period day.

The ESL courses at the beginning and intermediate levels emphasize communicative competence. The advanced and transitional courses emphasize grammar and literature. This is in keeping with the program's philosophy that acquisition comes first and learning (about the language) comes second (Krashen, 1982).

Advanced Level

The advanced ESOL student begins learning grammar and reading literature. The ESOL courses are reduced to two, and one more sheltered class is added.

The advanced schedule is as follows:

	Code	Content
1.	ESOL 3a	Grammar and Literature
2.	ESOL 3b	English for Social Studies
3.	Sheltered Mathematics	(Continuation class from intermediate level)
4.	Sheltered Science	(Continuation class from intermediate level)
5.	Sheltered Social Studies	(American History)
6.	Physical Education	(Student's choice)
7.	Elective[4]	(Student's choice)

The regular social studies course had to undergo some major modifications. First, since the students are immigrants, it was logical to introduce them to American History beginning with the colonization period. Second, the state-adopted text showed a readability level of Grade 12 (native speakers have difficulty reading the text). This text was replaced by a set of texts that covered the same content but whose text was more comprehensible to the students. The teachers gave input for a course guide written especially for this course by the district's social studies consultant.

The curriculum design has a built-in support system between the ESL and the content areas. The English for Math is taught the first time that sheltered mathematics is introduced; the English for Science is taught when the first sheltered science course is on the schedule; and so on.

[4]Only in Grades 7-8. Senior high schools have a six-period day.

Transitional Level

The transitional level has no ESL courses. There are two sheltered courses, and the remainder are unsheltered courses from the regular curriculum.

The typical transitional schedule is as follows:

Code	Content
1. E301 or E201	(regular freshman, English, Grammar, literature and composition)
2. S021	American History

An ESL teacher teaches the student's first regular English class in a sheltered setting in order to use appropriate methodologies and strategies (Chamot, 1984). This design immerses the students in English instruction that is comprehensible to them at their level of proficiency. The quantity and quality of comprehension which the student acquires by the time he leaves the program are generally sufficient for his participation in regular classes. Generally, the quantity and quality of production that the student can produce correlate directly to the stimulus of the school environment (the percentage of native speakers on the school campus). The student's speaking ability is usually less than his comprehension level.

The ESL curriculum is the same in Grades 7-12, thus the students can progress from one level to the next without repetition.

TABLE B

ESOL COURSES, GRADES 7-12: SCHOOLED CURRICULUM

COURSE CODE			COURSE DESCRIPTION	PREREQUISITE(S)	COMMENTS
GRADE 7	GRADE 8	GRS. 9-12			
J780	J890	E110	ESOL 1a	6 years of schooling in native country, 29 or below on LA Form of CELT, and 0-19 on SA Form of CELT	Listening, Understanding, & Speaking
J781	J891	E115	ESOL 1b		Speaking & Writing
J782	J892	E120	ESOL 1c		Reading & Composition
J783	J893	E125	ESOL 1d		English for Math
J784	J894	E130	ESOL 2a	ESOL 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d or 20-28 on SA Form of CELT	Listening, Understanding, & Speaking
J785	J895	E135	ESOL 2b		Reading & Composition
J786	J896	E140	ESOL 2c		English for Science
J787	J897	E145	ESOL 3a	ESOL 2a, 2b, 2c, or above 28 on SA Form of CELT	Grammar & Literature
J788	J898	E150	ESOL 3b		English for Social Studies

Limited Schooling Curriculum

The curriculum design for students with limited or no schooling is similar to that of schooled students in all important respects. It has four more ESOL courses because the beginning level is longer (two years in the junior high school; one year in the senior high school). The slower pace is essential because the skill development for these students begins at the pre-literacy level. Many have never been in a classroom in their native country and are not literate in their native language. It became necessary to add a native language component for these students because progress in a second language is directly tied to competence in the native language (Cummins, 1978). The students who make remarkable progress in this curriculum can be placed in the schooled curriculum upon recommendation by the program teachers.

T A B L E C

ESOL COURSES, GRADES 7-12: LIMITED SCHOOLING CURRICULUM

COURSE CODE			COURSE DESCRIPTION	PREREQUISITE(S)	COMMENTS
GRADE 7	GRADE 8	GRS. 9-12			
J789	J899	E109	ESOL 1a LS	Less than 6 years of schooling in native country, 29 or below on LA Form of CELT, and 0-19 on SA Form of CELT	Listening, Understanding, & Speaking
J790	J819	E114	ESOL 1b LS		English for the Basic Curriculum
J791	J821	E119	ESOL 1c LS		Prereading & Writing
J792	J822	E124	ESOL 1d LS		English for Fundamentals of Math
J793	J829	E111	ESOL 2a LS	ESOL 1a LS, 1b LS, 1c LS, and 1d LS	Listening, Understanding, & Speaking
J794	J831	E116	ESOL 2b LS		English for the Basic Curriculum
J795	J832	E121	ESOL 2c LS		Language Experience for Reading & Writing
J798	J833	E126	ESOL 2d LS		English for Basic Math
J799	J837	E129	ESOL 3a LS	ESOL 2a LS, 2b LS, 2c LS, and 2d LS	Listening, Understanding, & Communicating
J766	J838	E134	ESOL 3b LS		Reading & Composition
J767	J839	E139	ESOL 3c LS		English for the Basic Curriculum
J768	J847	E144	ESOL 4a LS	ESOL 3a LS, 3b LS, and 3c LS	Basic Grammar & Literature
J769	J849	E149	ESOL 4b LS		English for the Basic Curriculum

The district-wide enrollment of LEP students with limited schooling in Grades 7-12 is 41. Several HILT center schools have had to place these students in a multi-level classroom because of the small enrollments. Most high school teachers do not have the expertise to work with these students, and thus need training. Experienced elementary teachers in the program, however, have been successful with these students.

In-service Education

In-service education for HILT teachers has played an important role in the success of the program. Most of the teachers who were employed to work in the program had little or no experience teaching English as a Second Language, and most were inexperienced in teaching foreign-born students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Almost all of the teachers were inexperienced in teaching nonliterate adolescents.

The staff development plan was based on a needs assessment conducted by the Office for Research and Evaluation, observations made by the bilingual education consultant, and needs identified by principals. The staff development plan addressed four main areas:

I. Theory of Second Language Acquisition and Applied Linguistics Research

II. Methods and Approaches
- Comprehension and Listening
- Speaking
- Literacy and Reading
- Handwriting and Composition
- Content Areas

III. Techniques
- Audiovisual (teacher prepared)
- Audiovisual (commercially prepared)
- Study Skills

IV. Student Development and Administrative Details
- Motivation
- Culture (school and student)
- Correction and Discipline
- Evaluation and Testing

An average of 15 in-service workshops (beyond those required by the state) are held each school year. About half of the workshops are held on released time. The other half are conducted after school and on Saturdays. About half of the workshops held on teacher time are paid. There is about 60-75% attendance at the workshops held on teacher time. Many of the workshops are now being conducted by the program teachers. It is not uncommon for the program teachers to organize and conduct their own workshops.

Constant request for feedback about problems which teachers are having in the classroom and the immediate response to those problems through staff development is imperative. An especially effective in-service training approach has been

to use program teachers who are successful in the identified problem areas to help those who are experiencing the problems.

Content area teachers responsible for the sheltered classes also need staff development. They often want to help the students but are not aware of how to make their instruction more appropriate to these students. Classroom observation and workshop comments indicate a marked difference in attitude and performance of the content teachers after in-service training.

Staff development activities need to accommodate the different levels of expertise among the teaching staff as a way of making in-service education more relevant. Relevancy is central to motivation. Since the public schools have been charged with the prime responsibility[5] of teacher training in this field, motivation becomes a key factor.

PROGRAM RESULTS

HILT program students are experiencing successes that were rare before the implementation of the program.[6] HILT students' names appear on the honor roll of every center school. In May 1984, all high schools reported at least one HILT student in the National Honor Society. All but one junior high school reported at least two HILT students in the Junior National Honor Society. Several HILT students have graduated in the top 10% of their class. Students are being awarded scholarships for college study.

HILT students also received top honors at the 1984 Modern Languages Speech Tournament (a regional competition) in the ESL division. HILT students won all but two first place awards in that competition. We also see these students receiving special recognition in athletics, choir, school newspaper, and other student activities.

HILT Follow-Up Study

The district's Office for Research and Evaluation conducted a study (Schneider, 1985) to investigate the percentages of HILT students making passing grades in the regular content courses. The 464 subjects of the study were students enrolled in the HILT program during the 1982-83 school year. These students were placed in beginning or intermediate level curricula during the year 1982-83. Their grades in the content courses were earned from 1982-83 to 1983-84 and compared with the grades non-HILT students made in those same courses during the 1983-84 school year.[7]

---

[5]The four ESL endorsement courses required for endorsement are insufficient and in some cases inappropriate to public school teaching.

[6]According to teachers and administrators who have worked with these students for the past 15 or more years.

[7]The district-wide grade distributions for non-HILT students did not change significantly during the 1982-83 and 1983-84 school years.

The 464 students in the study represent about one third of the total number of students enrolled in the program during the 1982-83 school year. Seventy percent (70%) of the students in the study are still enrolled in local high schools or have graduated, 5% have moved, and 25% have dropped (12% less than the national average[8]). The main reason given for dropping out is age (19-20) or to return to Mexico. The dropout rate decreases to 15% (22% less than the national average[8]) for the students who stay with the program through transitional level.

Twenty-one percent (21%) of the students in the study (who are still enrolled in EPISD) are now seniors and 36% are juniors. Those students who graduated had a mean grade point average of 77.9. The range was a low of 71.2 to a high of 85.9.

The Follow-up study clearly indicates that the HILT students pass their regular English and content courses when they are placed in sheltered classes. A higher percentage of HILT students were successful in passing both English and most content courses than were non-HILT students in those courses, (See Table D). The HILT group outperformed the non-HILT group in 8 out of 11 courses.

HILT students also achieve better than district non-HILT students when they are placed in unsheltered low-level content courses, (See Table E). The high achievement may be due to improper placement. Sometimes on-level sheltered classes are not available and students are placed below their ability level rather than in an on-level unsheltered class. It is considered the lesser of two evils since it is better to succeed in an easy course than it is to fail because of lack of English. This placement allows students to pick up English but it does not increase their content knowledge. The HILT students clearly outperformed the district's low-level students in 5 out of 6 courses.

The HILT students do not perform as well when they are placed in courses beyond their English comprehension level, (See Table F). The data shows that HILT students do not do as well as district non-HILT students when placed in unsheltered on-level courses prematurely. The HILT group, however, outperformed or did as well as the non-HILT group in 4 courses; in 5 courses there was only a 9% or less difference in the groups; and only in 3 courses was there a 10% or more difference between the groups.

An important observation is that the HILT group performed as well as or better than the non-HILT group in 2 out of the 5 post-HILT courses (see the last 5 courses listed in Table F). In those courses where the HILT group did not perform as well as the non-HILT group, there was only a 4% difference in two courses and a 9% difference in one course.

In summary, this study provides evidence that the program is meeting its goal of preparing non-English speaking students to function in content classes. The most obvious finding is that the students need a comprehensible curriculum in order to be successful. The appropriate sheltered content courses appear to have a direct effect on the success of the students.

---

[8]Refers to the Diaz, 1984 Report.

TABLE D

HILT STUDENTS' AND NON-HILT STUDENTS'
PERFORMANCE IN ENGLISH AND CONTENT COURSES

	COURSES	PERCENT PASSING	
		HILT STUDENTS IN SHELTERED COURSES	NON-HILT STUDENTS
ENGLISH	Correlated Language Arts (E201) (E200)	94%	78%
	English 1a (E301) (E300)	95%	80%
SCIENCE	Physical Science a (C041) (C040)	92%	80%
	Physical Science b (C051) (C050)	82%	81%
	Biology 1a (C141) (C140)	93%	85%
SOCIAL STUDIES	U.S. History a (S011) (S010)	86%	79%
	U.S. History b (S021) (S020)	83%	81%
MATHEMATICS	Pre-Algebra a (M501) (M500)	82%[9]	71%
	Pre-Algebra b (M511) (M510)	77%[9]	88%
	Algebra 1a (M601) (M600)	56%[9]	75%
	Algebra 1b (M611) (M610)	56%	81%

[9]The low percentages of HILT students passing in these sheltered mathematics courses may reflect the misplacement of students. Mathematics placement scores are not always available for new arrivals, thus students are often placed in any available mathematics class.

TABLE E

UNSHELTERED BELOW GRADE LEVEL COURSES

	COURSES	PERCENT PASSING	
		DISTRICT	HILT
MATH	Fundamentals of Math a	75%	88%
	Consumer Math 1b	78%	100%
SCIENCE	Introduction to Physical Science a	74%	78%
	Introduction to Physical Science b	81%	85%
	Introduction to Biology a	79%	91%
	Introduction to Biology b	82%	77%

TABLE F

UNSHELTERED ON GRADE LEVEL COURSES

	COURSES	PERCENT PASSING	
		DISTRICT	HILT
MATHEMATICS	Pre-Algebra a	71%	75%
	Pre-Algebra b	88%	86%
	Algebra 1a	75%	69%
	Algebra 1b	81%	88%
SCIENCE	Physical Science a	80%	71%
	Physical Science b	81%	67%
	Biology 1a	85%	73%
SOCIAL STUDIES	U.S. History a	79%	70%
	U.S. History b	81%	64%
	World Geography a[10]	89%	80%
	World Geography b[10]	81%	83%
	World History a[10]	86%	86%
	World History b[10]	88%	84%
	U.S. Government a[10]	86%	82%

[10]Post HILT courses.

Bilingual Education Pilot Programs Interim Study Report

The HILT program was selected to participate as a pilot program for the state of Texas by the Texas Education Agency in January 1982. The purpose of this effort was to identify approaches that could be effective in developing English proficiency for limited English proficient students. An interim study report (Texas Education Agency, 1985) was conducted and presented to the Texas State Board of Education. It is reported in the conclusions of this study that the successful programs at the secondary level were those which expanded the time dimension of English language development and provided sheltered content courses aimed at ensuring greater student success and knowledge acquisition. The El Paso Independent School District HILT program was one of the secondary pilots to offer both sheltered content courses and expanded time in English language development. It was the program which demonstrated the most progress in English and content course work of all the secondary pilots.[11]

Both studies mentioned above report the success of students based on hard data collected on participants who were enrolled in the program during its first year.

CONCLUSION

Our experience these past three years confirms the success that can be achieved when school administrators and teachers view the students as language learners capable of achievement, make instruction comprehensible, and make the necessary changes in the system to meet the needs of the learners. All three factors must be present to make success possible. The procedure is not a simple, quick solution to a difficult complex problem, but it is a viable way to meet our responsibility of providing equal educational opportunity and a quality education to the students. Success for these students is success for us too, as Alan Pifer warns in his report to the President (Pifer, 1970):

> "Working in favor of such special efforts to see that Hispanic students succeed are demographic trends. Hispanics, with their relatively high fertility rates, are producing a significant and growing part of today's relatively small cohort of children on whom the burden later of an aging American society is going to be exceedingly heavy. It may be asked whether in these circumstances the country can continue to afford treating any proportion of its youth as expendable. If not, we should not deceive ourselves into thinking that in furthering the education of Hispanic children we would be doing it out of the goodness of our hearts; we would be doing it for ourselves as well" (p. 18).

This is the success story we came to share this year. We hope to have many more happy endings to add.

---

[11]Conversation with Thomas Krueck, Ph.D., Director, Special Programs Division of Planning and Research, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas.

REFERENCES

Apodaca, Rosa E. 1981. A high intensity language program: A center approach. In an unpublished precis prepared for the El Paso Independent School District for presentation to the ESL Committee.

Apodaca, Rosa E. 1983. High intensity language training program information, 1983-84. El Paso, Texas: El Paso Independent School District.

Bilingual Education Pilot Programs, Interim Study Report. 1985. Staff Report to the State Board of Education. Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency. p. 18.

Carter, Thomas P. and Roberto D. Segura. 1970. MEXICAN AMERICANS IN SCHOOL. Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board.

Chamot, Anna Uhl. 1983. Toward a functional ESL curriculum in the elementary school. TESOL QUARTERLY 17(8):459.

Chamot, Anna Uhl. 1984. A transfer curriculum for teaching content-based ESL in the elementary school. ON TESOL '83. pp. 130-132. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Cummins, James. 1978. Educational implications of mother tongue maintenance in minority-language groups. THE CANADIAN REVIEW 34:395-416.

Diaz, William A. 1984. Hispanics: Challenges and opportunities. Ford Foundation Working Papers. New York: Ford Foundation.

Harris, David P. and Palmer Leslie A. 1970. Comprehensive English Language Test. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Pifer, Alan. 1979. Bilingual education and the hispanic challenge. 1979 Annual Report. New York: Carnegie Corporation. p. 18.

Schneider, Susan. 1985. HILT follow-up study. El Paso, Texas: El Paso Independent School District.

Smith, Frank. 1983. Twelve easy ways to make learning to read difficult. In ESSAYS INTO LITERACY. London, England: Heinemann Press. pp. 12-25.